

THIS OPINION WAS NOT WRITTEN FOR PUBLICATION

The opinion in support of the decision being entered today (1) was not written for publication in a law journal and (2) is not binding precedent of the Board.

Paper No. 20

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES

---

Ex parte MARTIN W. GREATLINE and  
STANLEY E. GREATLINE

---

Appeal No. 96-1460  
Application 07/882,811<sup>1</sup>

---

ON BRIEF

---

Before THOMAS, JERRY SMITH and TORCZON, Administrative Patent Judges.

THOMAS, Administrative Patent Judge.

DECISION ON APPEAL

---

<sup>1</sup> Application for patent filed May 14, 1992.

Appellants have appealed to the Board from the examiner's final rejection of claims 1 to 16, which constitute all the claims in the application.

Representative claim 1 is reproduced below:

1. A prescription farming control system for use in controlling product delivery mechanisms mounted on an applicator vehicle, the delivery mechanisms operable to deliver product to spreader mechanisms for spreading products over an agricultural field, each of the product delivery mechanisms having a device controller which controls the rate of operation of the corresponding delivery mechanism in response to a control signal derived in accordance with a prescription for the field, the control system comprising:

means for storing in a digital memory information defining a digital map representative of the prescription for the field, the map being defined by a number of layers, each layer corresponding to one of the product delivery mechanisms, and each layer including a number of zones, each zone corresponding to a rate of application of the corresponding product in accordance with the prescription for the field at a plurality of global positions within the zone;

means for storing a data table containing control signal values for each of said number of zones in each of said number of layers, said control signal values being indicative of the rate of application of the product associated with a corresponding layer at positions of the vehicle within a corresponding zone;

navigation means for determining the current position of the applicator vehicle on the agricultural field in global coordinates as the vehicle moves over the field; and

means for transmitting, to each device controller, selected ones of said control signal values corresponding to said zone of each layer for which the determined current

Appeal No. 96-1460  
Application 07/882,811

position of the vehicle corresponds to one of said plurality of global positions within the zone.

The following reference is relied on by the examiner:

Hanson et al. (Hanson)	5,050,771	Sep. 24,
1991		

Claims 1, 4, 5, 9, 11 to 13, 15 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Hanson.

Claims 2, 3, 6 to 8, 10 and 14 to 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Hanson alone.

Rather than repeat the positions of appellants and the examiner, reference is made to the briefs and the answer for the respective details thereof.

#### OPINION

We reverse the rejection of all claims on appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and § 103.

Turning first to the rejection of independent claims 1 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102, each of these claims recites a navigation means for determining the current position of the applicator vehicle on the agricultural field in global coordinates as the vehicle moves over the field. The claims further recite a means for storing in a digital memory data

defining a digital map further defining a number of layers, each of which has various zones corresponding to a rate of application of a product at a plurality of global positions within the zone. Finally, at the end of each claim there is recited the determination of the current position of the vehicle corresponding to one of these previously recited plurality of global positions within each zone.

The examiner's reliance upon col. 2, lines 55 to 59 of Hanson to provide a basis for all of these navigation features is misplaced since we find that the reference does not disclose or otherwise anticipate all of these features as referenced in each of independent claims 1 and 13 on appeal. We recognize as do appellants that every point of a given field has inherently some associated global coordinates such as latitude and longitude associated with it. However, there is no evidence before us that Hanson necessarily, in the sense of inherency as apparently argued by the examiner, teaches the associated global coordinates and global positions in his system as recited in these claims on appeal. Hanson's system uses a dead reckoning-type navigation system. The examiner's reasoning also appears to bridge over into reasoning

appropriate within 35 U.S.C. § 103 but not 35 U.S.C. § 102.

In view of these findings, we reverse the rejection of claims 1 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and their respective dependent claims as set forth by the examiner in the above noted rejection.

Lastly, independent claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Hanson alone. Even if we accept the basic position of the examiner, based upon the teaching at col. 2, lines 55 to 59 of Hanson, that a global coordinate type of navigation system was known in the art and would have been obvious to the artisan to have utilized in the system of Hanson, we must reverse the rejection of independent claim 14 because we remain unconvinced that the teachings and showings within this reference would have made obvious to the artisan all the details with respect to the graphics processor in this claim. At pages 4 and 5 of the answer, the examiner merely asserts that the display 60 in Fig. 5 and the teaching at the bottom of col. 8 would have rendered obvious to the artisan the graphics processor clause and the function of the layer of maps therewithin. Additionally, at page 5 of the answer, the examiner admits that Hanson does not teach layers

Appeal No. 96-1460  
Application 07/882,811

corresponding to delivery mechanisms. The examiner's responsive arguments to appellants' position in the brief at pages 7 and 8 of the answer also do not convince us of the obviousness of the subject matter of the graphics processor clause of claim 14. The examiner does not argue and there is no apparent teaching or showing in Hanson, for example, of a graphics memory partitioned with an active invisible page and an inactive visible page utilized in the manner recited in this graphic processor clause of claim 14. Therefore, we remain unconvinced of the obviousness of the subject matter of independent claim 14 on appeal as a whole without more prior art evidence than that provided.

Appeal No. 96-1460  
Application 07/882,811

In view of the foregoing, since we reverse the rejection of all claims on appeal, the decision of the examiner is reversed.

REVERSED

	)	
JAMES D. THOMAS	)	
Administrative Patent Judge	)	
	)	
	)	
	)	BOARD OF PATENT
JERRY SMITH	)	
Administrative Patent Judge	)	APPEALS AND
	)	
	)	INTERFERENCES
	)	
RICHARD TORCZON	)	
Administrative Patent Judge	)	

Appeal No. 96-1460  
Application 07/882,811

Michael D. Beck  
Woodard Emhardt Naughton  
Moriarty & McNett  
Bank One Center/Tower  
111 Monument Circle  
Suite 3700  
Indianapolis, IN 46204